

Message

From: Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=3C5A111DC377411595E5B24B5D96146B-ORME-ZAVALITA, JENNIFER]
Sent: 1/19/2019 8:52:37 PM
To: Blackburn, Elizabeth [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=a080eb90549a453aaa6a357f5257c0b7-Blackburn, Elizabeth]
Subject: Re: [SPAM-Sender] Re: [SPAM-Sender] Re: QFRs

Tnx

Jennifer Orme-Zavaleta, PhD
Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science
Office of Research and Development
US EPA

Cell: [REDACTED]
DC: [REDACTED] Personal Matters / Ex. 6
RTP: [REDACTED]

On Jan 19, 2019, at 3:50 PM, Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

FYI. **Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Liz Blackburn
Chief of Staff
EPA Office of Research and Development
202-564-2192
Cell: [REDACTED] Personal Matters / Ex. 6 B

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tina Bahadori <[REDACTED] Personal Matters / Ex. 6 >
Date: January 19, 2019 at 3:36:46 PM EST
To: "Blackburn, Elizabeth" <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Cc: "Bahadori, Tina" <Bahadori.Tina@epa.gov>, "Ross, Mary" <Ross.Mary@epa.gov>,
[REDACTED] Personal Matters / Ex. 6 [REDACTED] Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Subject: [SPAM-Sender] Re: [SPAM-Sender] Re: QFRs

Hi Liz,

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Thanks,

Tina

On Jan 19, 2019, at 12:22 PM, Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Tina and Mary

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Liz

Liz Blackburn
Chief of Staff
EPA Office of Research and Development
202-564-2192
Mobile: [Personal Matters / Ex. 6](#)

From: Tina Bahadori <[Personal Matters / Ex. 6](#)>
Sent: Saturday, January 19, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Cc: Bahadori, Tina <Bahadori.Tina@epa.gov>; Ross, Mary <Ross.Mary@epa.gov> <[Personal Matters / Ex. 6](#)>
Subject: [SPAM-Sender] Re: QFRs

Ok, Liz [Deliberative Process / Ex. 5](#) We will see what we can do with these ASAP.

Tina

On Jan 19, 2019, at 11:32 AM, Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Tina and Mary

Not surprisingly, NCEA wins the prize for the most responses ORD needs to respond to. There are four below and I'm attaching the full list simply for context.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Can you please have responses back to me by noon on Tuesday so that I can compile and get them to Jennifer, Chris, and David by Noon on Tuesday.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks

Liz

Please provide a copy of the IRIS Handbook that has been completed but is not yet published. (Sen Carper question)

The EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) program completed revisions of its formaldehyde assessment in the fall of 2017. In reports accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017, both chambers of Congress directed that the agency contract with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to conduct an external peer review of the revised IRIS formaldehyde assessment. Accordingly, EPA has already provided \$1 million to the NAS for this purpose. The January 2018 EPA IRIS report to Congress indicated that “IRIS plans to deliver an External Review of its Formaldehyde Assessment for public comment and peer review in FY18.” I have repeatedly inquired about the status of the IRIS formaldehyde assessment and repeatedly requested that EPA advance the assessment to finalization—a process that involves intra- and inter-agency review, external peer review by the NAS, and public comment.

- a. Will the IRIS program continue to work on and finalize its formaldehyde assessment? If not, why not?
- b. Please provide the timeline and agenda items that will allow EPA to complete the remaining steps in the review process for the revised IRIS formaldehyde assessment.
 - i. <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->When will the agency initiate the intra-agency review process?
 - ii. <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->When will the agency initiate the inter-agency review process?
 - iii. <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->When will the agency release the revised assessment for public comment and peer review?
 - iv. <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->When will EPA finalize the IRIS formaldehyde assessment?

- c. Will you commit to providing the revised IRIS formaldehyde assessment to NAS for peer review by no later than the end of calendar year 2019?
- d. Please explain why formaldehyde is absent from the 2018 IRIS Program Outlook.

Please explain the process used to develop the 2018 IRIS Program Outlook, from first inception to completion. In your response, please identify the program and regional offices, including the names of specific individuals, consulted or otherwise involved. Please also identify any other organizations and specific individuals consulted or otherwise involved. (Senator Markey sent this and the questions below.)

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5 The Harvard “Six Cities” study, which linked air pollution and mortality risk, is a key study used in assessing many air quality regulations. In 2011, the EPA estimated that the control of particulate air pollution saved 160,000 lives in 2010, and that it will save 230,000 lives in 2020.

- a. Under the EPA’s proposed “Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science” rule, would the EPA be able to use the Six Cities study?
- b. As Administrator, do you see any danger in moving forward with the “Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science” rule and eliminating the use of studies like the Six Cities study

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5 At a recent meeting of the EPA Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC), multiple members of CASAC expressed doubt that they had the scientific experience to manage reviewing the science on particulate matter, which includes divergent scientific fields from epidemiology, to toxicology to data science to instrumentation.

- a. Do you still believe that this CASAC has the requisite expertise to provide you with advice on particulate matter?
- b. Epidemiology is a key subject for assessing the health impacts of

- particulate matter such as early death and cardiovascular illness, yet not a single epidemiologist is on CASAC. How can CASAC adequately assess the science on particulate and health, when its members do not have expertise in key fields like epidemiology and when there is no particulate matter review panel?
- c. Has CASAC consulted with outside experts on PM and ozone standards? If so, with whom?

Liz Blackburn
Chief of Staff
EPA Office of Research and Development
202-564-2192
Mobile: Personal Matters / Ex. 6

<ORD 2019.01.18 - PROGRAM OFFICE DESIGNATED -
ALL QFRs Wheeler 01.16.2019.docx>